



Securing Kiribati's Natural Heritage: Protected areas for community, atoll, and island climate resilience (Securing Kiribati)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10775

Countries

Kiribati

Project Name

Securing Kiribati's Natural Heritage: Protected areas for community, atoll, and island climate resilience (Securing Kiribati)

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

11/14/2022

Review completed by PM

12/15/2023

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/10/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

9/15/2023

No, please revise component 2 as discussed below.

IUCN, 20 October

Agency Response

Thank you very much for your comments. The Component 2 has been reworked in line with the advice provided. The changes are highlighted in the uploaded ProDoc and highlighted in yellow in the CEO Endorsement Request.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2023

Yes and thank you for identifying additional co-financing.

10/31/2023

No, please address the following -

a. ?In-kind? is usually classified as ?recurrent expenditures?. Please replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? where type of co-financing is in-kind.

b. Most of co-financing support letters are dated in November 2022. Please request agency to provide a letter with a date or to provide an updated estimate of the actual amount that the agency think will go to the project considering the timeframe for both ? the co-finance and the GEF project.

9/15/2023

No, co-financing is below 1:1. This creates real doubts about whether the activities will actually be completed given the need for significant engagement from the government to successfully execute the project. Does this accurately reflect government co-financing? Please discuss how the project will continue to look for co-financing and ways to collaborate during execution and how to needed flexibility will be provided.

Agency Response
IUCN, 6 December 2023

- a. Kindly note that we have corrected and classified in-kind cofinancing as ?recurrent expenditure?
- b. Kindly note that we have uploaded updated cofinancing letters for the following cofinanciers:
 1. GGGI
 2. MELAD
 3. MFMRD
 4. Island Conservation
 5. IUCN

IUCN, 20 October

Thank you very much for this comment. Kindly note that we have obtaining additional cofinancing letters resulting in the cofinancing ratio being 1:3. The additional cofinancing is as follows:

- A. Global Green Growth Institute ? USD 2, 600, 000

Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development ? USD 24, 792, 644
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2023

Yes.

11/27/2023

No, please use the categories included in the Guidelines to present the details of the status of the use of PPG resources.

9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
IUCN, 6 December 2023

Kindly note that we have uploaded a corrected version of the PPG utilisation budget in the correct format

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2023

Yes

12/7/2023

No, please note Kiribati is on the WBG's list of FCV countries and CCA Core Indicator 1 should not be blank. There should be people benefitting beyond training.

10/31/2023

No, the justification relies on the biodiversity value rather than the adaptation justification. The entirety of the results delivered for \$5m in LDCF resources is 550 people trained according to the core indicators for adaptation. Suggestions were already provided. Please revise the explanation.

9/15/2023

Yes. However, it would be good to include somewhere a description/justification of why the number of people supported for CCA is so low relative to the amount of money invested. Such a justification could include lack of investment in outer islands for CCA and the high cost of traveling to those places.

IUCN, 14 December 2023

Kindly note that the CCA Core Indicator 1 is now included

IUCN, 6 December 2023

As advised, the explanation has been revised to reflect adaptation related justification

IUCN, 20 October

Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this is now included in the relevant notes section of the Core Indicator page of the online CER

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/31/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/2/2023

No, there are some issues remaining regarding component 2 and related activities in the project. Please ensure that suggested changes discussed can be included in the project and revise accordingly.

For the capacity building and training activities, please describe sustainability plans and how the project will support turnover in leadership.

IUCN, 20 October

Agency Response

Thank you very much for your comment. The Component 2 has been reworked in line with the advice provided. The changes are highlighted in the uploaded ProDoc and highlighted in yellow in the CEO Endorsement Request. This includes description on sustainability plans and how the project will support turnover in leadership.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
9/15/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/10/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/2/2023

No, the biodiversity justification is rather limited for the Gilbert Islands. Please discuss some of the species (especially IUCN RL Threatened species) and/or special ecosystems that will receive protection or improved management from this project. The CSA interventions likely will have benefits perhaps in reduced fishing pressure and/or improved water quality. Also, a sentence or two on the tremendous biodiversity value of PIPA would be good as well (noting that it is a World Heritage site for example).

IUCN, 20 October

Agency Response

Thank you very much for this comment. Kindly note that this is now revised and included in the relevant section of the CER.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
11/10/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/2/2023

No. Please do not call this project "not innovative" all projects need to be innovative. Innovation does not have to come with fancy technology or fresh from the literature methodologies. Innovation is also taking a holistic approach to island planning and development that incorporates and supports traditional knowledge and custom.

In this context, sustainability is not about the environment but rather the durability or how the project activities and interventions will be sustained at project end. Please provide information on this.

Agency Response
IUCN, 20 October

Thank you very much for your comment. We completely agree and the overall aim of the project is to be innovative in identifying ways that will support sustainable development in the context of Kiribati culture, traditions and ?know how?. The whole innovative approach of the project will be understood if it looked at holistically through the various components and how their linkages.

Additionally, the project?s innovation will come from building resilience of the communities and community leaders to conserve important biodiversity areas for well-being and to sustain them in the long term.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2023

Yes.

10/31/2023

No, please fill in the Geo location in the portal

10/2/2023

No, please include the maps in the portal.

IUCN, 6 December 2023

The geo-locations for each of the project sites have been added in the portal

IUCN, 20 October

Agency Response

Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that the maps are now included

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2023

Yes, We note that specific details of stakeholder engagement are not available at this time for the activities on the outer islands, but that FPIC and community consultation are part of the project. At the first PIR, please include more information about stakeholder engagement and the groups involved.

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/7/2023

Yes.

11/27/2023

No, although the project has noted that gender equality and women's empowerment would be a cross-cutting theme to be addressed in the project, per GEF's guidelines, the Agency is requested to:

a. Link the identified gender gaps to project/program objectives and activities and indicate in the project description and specific project components and outputs how the gender gaps would be addressed. For example (not exhaustive), please address gender dimensions in Output 2.1.4; in Outcome 3.1, please ensure that the plans and initiatives developed are

gender-responsive (engage women and gender experts in the development or revision of any plans and initiatives; go beyond awareness-raising benefitting women). In Project Component 4, please disaggregate indicators by sex; Output 4.1.3 should include best practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective.

b. Please ensure that gender dimensions within the project components are budgeted for, monitored and reported on.

c. In Section 3 ? Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment, please expand this section to include a summary of the gender analysis and specifics on the gender action plan.

9/15/2023

Yes.

IUCN, 6 December 2023

Agency Response

As advised the project proposal, CEO endorsement request and the Annex on gender and social inclusion has been updated with changes reflected in yellow. This includes linking identified gender gaps to project/program objectives and activities, gender dimensions being budgeted for and monitored, providing a summary of the gender analysis and specifics on the gender action plan in the ProDoc and CER.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/10/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

9/15/2023

No, please note that private sector does not have to be large scale or multinational. If the project is conducting value chain analysis and supporting farmers and fishers to work on that, then there is a private sector component.

Tuna fisheries are also a large private sector piece that is very much involved in the project, and it would be good to have some consideration of that here.

IUCN, 20 October

Agency Response

Thank you very much for your comment. Kindly note that this is now addressed in the revised ProDoc as well as the online CER.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/2/2023

Yes, thank you for the honest assessment of the risks and challenges this project faces.

Agency Response **Coordination**

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/7/2023

Yes.

11/27/2023

No,

- Audits are charged to M&E, but have to be charged to PMC ? please ask the Agency to amend

- the budget for M&E represents close to 10% of the total project budget. The observed M&E budget during GEF-6 and GEF-7 where around 2% for project above 10M. Please request the agency to review.

10/2/2023

Yes.

IUCN, 6 December 2023

Agency Response

This is now amended as advised and the M&E budget has been accordingly reduced to around 2% while audit charges are now part of PMC budget as reflected in Annex E and the uploaded updated detailed budget

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes (see above on describing GEBs).

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/19/2023

No, please review and respond to these carefully.

- Audits are merged with mid-term and final evaluation + mission, and charged to Project Components and M&E (see un blue below). As mentioned in the past two reviews, Audits must be charged to PMC.

- The comments provided on Dec. 13th about Project personnel that included ?among others? Government staff are responded by transforming those into three budget lines (Technical Specialists, Project Management Consultants and Miscellaneous consultants ? in green below) with no specification on what these positions will be responsible for ? hence, it is not possible to assess the reasonability of these positions being charged to the Project Components. For instance, Project Management consultants will not be eligible because there is a PMU charged to PMC (in orange below) to Manage the project ? we cannot clear a project with these inconsistencies and lack of clarity in the budget table.

12/14/2023

No, some issues remain:

- On table D: if the BD funds are drawn from the BD STAR allocation (as it would seem to be in table F) then please request the agency to correct the programming of funds in table D (if this is not corrected, the amount for this project will not be reflected in the reports).

- in the Budget table, Audits still are in the M&E Budget ? in the Budget Table, Audits are mixed with mid-term and final evaluation + mission, and charged to the Project components and M&E, not to PMC.

- regarding this comment, in the Review Sheet the Agency responded ?This is now amended as advised and the M&E budget has been accordingly reduced to around 2% while audit charges are now part of PMC budget as reflected in Annex E and the uploaded updated detailed budget? ? however, in the M&E Table still the previous amount (\$989,750) was left ? please amend.

•

•On the Budget Table: as mentioned on November 20th, whenever the resubmission with the correct template would come, we would be in a position to provide comments if appropriate. See the comments below:

•The project's staff (yellow shadow) is charged to the project components ? per Guidelines, Project staff must be charged to the GEF portion and co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please ask the Agency to revise.

•The budget table includes Government staff salaries (in blue shadow) ? per Guidelines, Government officials cannot be paid with GEF resources. Please ask the Agency to revise.

11/27/2023

No, please address the following -

On project information: please correct the expected implementation start to a future date and update the expected completion date to match the duration of the project.

On the Project Management Cost: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 4.1%, for a co-financing of \$33,169,542 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,359,951 instead of \$534,050 (which is 1.6%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF Portion.

On the budget: please request the agency to use the correct budget template in Annex E and include one with columns with information on the responsible executing entity receiving GEF funds. Only whenever we get the correct template, we will be able to assess the reasonability of charging the different activities/positions to Project Components, M&E and PMC. When resubmitted, we will provide comments as appropriate.

On Annex B: it seems that some information has been removed. Please request the agency to review - if anything is missing, they need to update the table

Results framework table is off the margins ? please ask the Agency to amend (ITS can help as needed)

In Table D, please show the BD Programming of Funds as BD STAR.

Agency Response
IUCN, 20 December 2023

Audits

Kindly be informed that the reference to audits has been removed from the concerned budget line as these will be conducted as part of the Government's national audit process, hence not included in the PMC.

Project Consultants budget lines

Kindly note that the Government of Kiribati has clarified to us that there was no intention of financing existing staff using GEF funds and instead all the officers that were identified would be newly recruited. The positions were named as the same as government officials, as they were using the same salary scale as those for officials and then converted them to a daily rate as these would be reference for the consultants.

We have now further reworked the consultancy lines to refer to 5 consultancy positions for which the TORs have been uploaded as a new annex 6 as well as the detailed budget along with the updated Annex E. Please find below the 5 consultancy positions for which TORs have been included:

1. Principal Technical Ministerial Advisor
2. Departmental Technical Solutions Consultant
3. Island Programme Coordination Lead
4. Island Community Liaison Consultant
5. PIPA Environmental Management Advisor

Other budget adjustments

Kindly note that in addition to the above changes, an additional change has been made in the Component 3 budget: Increase in the budget for agriculture and aquaculture field activities by around 50% to USD 945,000 for each which is highlighted in Annex E as well as in the detailed budget.

IUCN, 14 December 2023

1. Table D: We apologise for the oversight previously and now the BD allocation is indicated in Table D
- 2a). Audits included in M&E Budget: Kindly note that we have removed all reference to audits from the M&E budget

2b). The M&E table included in the relevant M&E section of the CER is now consistent with the updated M&E budget

3. As advised we have revised the budget to remove the salary/staff time costs of government officials charged to project components and instead shown only the costs of the CTA and other essential project management costs under the PMC budget

IUCN, 6 December 2023

Project information: Kindly note that the implementation start has been revised to 1 March 2024

PMC: As advised, the cofinancing contribution to PMC is now proportionate to the GEF contribution to PMC

Annex E: Kindly note that we have provided the updated Annex E in the correct budget template

Annex B: Kindly note that we have corrected the Annex B and added the missing information

Results Framework: As advised we have reformatted the results framework table to be within the margins

Table D: As advised we have shown the programming of funds as BD STAR

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/2/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/14/2023

No, please again take care with responding to the repeat comments.

12/14/2023

No, please take care with some of the comments which are repeated from previous reviews.

12/7/2023

No, there are a few small corrections remaining.

11/27/2023

No, some small issues remain.

10/31/2023

No, please revise and resubmit.

10/2/2023

Not at this time. Please revise as described above. Please do not hesitate to reach out to the GEF Secretariat for further clarification if needed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		10/20/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		12/7/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		12/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		12/20/2023

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations